

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 20 2007

D. Remarks

Based on the above amendments and remarks that follow, reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

In the office action, the disclosure was objected to because in page 13, line 26, "Correlator 602" should have been "Correlator 604" as disclosed in figure 6. The specification has been amended as per the objections raised by the examiner in the office action. Correlator 602 at page 13, line 22 has been changed to Correlator 604,. A further reference number discrepancy in this paragraph was also noted, to correct this "maximum correlation identifier 604" at page 13, line 25 has been changed to "maximum correlation identifier 606".

Further, claims 1, 8, 10 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al. (US 5,706,314) in view of Chen (US 2005/0084025 A1). Claims 2 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al. (US 5,706,314) and of Chen (US 2005/0084025 A1) and further in view of Yang (US 7,016,404 B2). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al. (US 5,706,314) and of Chen (US 2005/0084025 A1) and further in view of Morita et al. (2003/0179813 A1). Claims 5 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al. (US 5,706,314) and of Chen (US 2005/0084025 A1) and in view of Baltersee et al. (US 2001/0014114 A1), and further in view of Ben-Eli (US 6,400,784 B1).

Claims 6-7, 9, and 15-16 were allowed. The notification of allowed subject matter is gratefully acknowledged.

In order to establish the novelty aspect of the present invention in view of the cited

art, the following amendments have been made: Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10-12, 14, and 17-18 have been cancelled without prejudice. Additionally, the dependency of claim 4 has been amended so as to make it dependent upon allowed independent claim 6. Similarly, the dependency of claim 13 has been amended so as to make it dependent upon allowed independent claim 15. As a result, dependent claims 4 and 13 are now allowable based on the corresponding allowed base claims.

Moreover, claims 3 and 12 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were noted as allowable if rewritten in independent form. In response thereto, allowable dependent claims 3 and 12 have been cancelled without prejudice because the limitations of the allowable dependent claims 3 and 12 are already present in allowed independent claims 6 and 15 respectively.

The present claims have been amended to highlight the distinctions of the present invention over the cited art and it is respectfully submitted that the claims are now clearly patentable over the art of record, and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this matter, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicant's attorney at the numbers listed below prior to issuing an advisory action.

Dated: July 20, 2007

Respectfully Submitted,

By 

William L. Botjer

Reg. No. 27,990

PO Box 478

Center Moriches, NY 11934

(212) 737-5728 (Tue-Thurs)

(631) 874-4826 (Mon & Fri)

(631) 834-0611 (cell if others busy)